

☒ UNCLASSIFIED☐ INTERNAL
USE ONLY☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

H.R. 2889. Computer Security Research and Training Act of 1985

FROM:

C/Policy Branch/PPG

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE 17 September 1985

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.

C/PPG

9/17

JH

2.

DD/RM

9/17

9/18

D

3.

C/PPG

9/20

JH

4.

C/Policy

9/23/85

JR

5.

Registry

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

I called [] and read her the gist of DoD's proposed statement on H.R. 2889. She could foresee no direct effect on Agency operations from this statement. We are somewhat sheltered from encroachment into Agency territory by the NSDD-145 principals, by way of the provision which recognizes the DCI's responsibility for protection of sources and methods. The greatest impact would be on the civilian agencies such as Treasury, where little classified but much sensitive data is involved.

The Agency generally requires, especially at contractor facilities, that sensitive data be handled the same as classified information. Thus there would not be a need to divide "sensitive" into subparts, nor would we want to dilute the meaning of the term.

I called [] at 1156 hours and discussed the above with him. He indicated that we might get another call from [] later today with yet another immediate requirement to review and comment on more testimony on this Bill.

1 to 2: FYI. This is item we had one hour to provide comment.

Thanks

N.B.: NSA Comments - harder line against H.R. 2889 than DoD, but same thrust - no reason to object. So advised by telephone. No time to review.

☐ SECRET☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ INTERNAL
USE ONLY☐ UNCLASSIFIED